



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/720,963

11/24/2003

Richard D. Dettinger

ROC920030278US1

5212

46797

7590

04/17/2008

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

DWIVEDI, MAHESH H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2168

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/720,963
Filing Date: November 24, 2003
Appellant(s): DETTINGER ET AL.

Gero G. McClellan
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 01/23/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 08/22/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,041,326	Amro et al.	05/01/2001
6,560,606	Young	08/24/2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Amro et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,041,326) in view of **Young** (U.S. Patent 6,560,606).

4. Regarding claim 1, **Amro** teaches a method comprising:

A) providing an interface for specifying the functional module (Column 10, lines 20-35);

B) providing a configuration file containing information regarding invocation of the functional module (Column 10, lines 20-35, and lines 52-60);

C) wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by the at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);

D) receiving the query result retrieved from the database (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);

E) invoking the functional module to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file (Column 10, lines 61-67-

Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2); and

F) returning the processed query result to the application (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**providing an interface for specifying the functional module**” as “As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism” (Column 10, lines 20-35). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches “**providing a configuration file containing information regarding invocation of the functional module**” as “As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a

customization/selection mechanism" (Column 10, lines 20-35) and "The type of plug-in program utilized herein depends upon the desires of a user. The user determines how many predefined traits are to be utilized during a search. For example, a user may be knowledgeable about a certain topic, and may want to avoid certain sites or areas altogether. Depending upon the type of plug-in program designated by the user, the search engine calls this plug-in program to perform the search, avoiding sites or areas in response to instructions processed by the plug-in program" (Column 10, lines 52-60). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by the at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e.,

setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"receiving the query result retrieved from the database"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search

engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"invoking the functional module to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is

then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"returning the processed query result to the application"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits"

with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

Amro does not explicitly teach:

G) plurality of functional modules.

Young, however, teaches "**plurality of functional modules**" as "A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins" (Column 9, lines 12-24) and "The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed" (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young's** would have allowed **Amro's** to provide a method for improving efficiency in

reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 2, **Amro** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein the interface is a graphic user interface utilized by users to specify a functional module (Column 10, lines 20-35).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein the interface is a graphic user interface utilized by users to specify a functional module**” as “As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism” (Column 10, lines 20-35).

Amro does not explicitly teach:

B) functional modules.

Young, however, teaches “**functional modules**” as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8

need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 3, **Amro** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein the interface allows an external application to specify a functional module (Column 10, lines 7-20).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein the interface allows an external application to specify a functional module**” as “As described at block 146, a plug-in program is designated for limiting the scope of on-line data searches to particular searches or to certain conditions (e.g., time conditions) such that the plug-in program may be called for processing by the on-line search engine during on-line data searches by the on-line search engine. A calling sequence is utilized to manage the link between the plug-in program and the search engine application. When a plug-in program call occurs, the calling sequence acts as an agreement between the calling

routine (i.e., the search engine) and the called plug-in program on how arguments will be passed and in what order, how values will be returned, and which routine will handle any necessary housekeeping (e.g., cleaning up the stack)” (Column 10, lines 7-20).

Amro does not explicitly teach:

B) functional modules.

Young, however, teaches “**functional modules**” as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in

reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 4, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

- A) wherein the interface is utilized to specify a single multi-analysis functional module used to invoke the plurality of functional modules; and
- B) the configuration file contains information relating the plurality of functional modules to the multi-analysis functional modules.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the interface is utilized to specify a single multi-analysis functional module used to invoke the plurality of functional modules**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the

infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6), and **“the configuration file contains information relating the plurality of functional modules to the multi-analysis functional modules”** as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching

Young's would have allowed **Amro's** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 5, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein the configuration file contains an explicit sequence in which the functional modules should be executed.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the configuration file contains an explicit sequence in which the functional modules should be executed**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young's** would have allowed **Amro's** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 6, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein the configuration file contains information indicating one or more parameters required for invoking each of the functional modules; and

B) invoking the plurality of functional modules comprises invoking only those functional modules whose one or more required parameters are available.

Young, however, teaches **“wherein the configuration file contains information indicating one or more parameters required for invoking each of the functional modules”** as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60), and **“invoking the plurality of functional modules comprises invoking only those functional modules whose one or more required parameters are available”** as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework

425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 7, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein invoking the plurality of functional modules in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file comprises invoking at least two functional modules in parallel.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein invoking the plurality of functional modules in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file comprises invoking at least two functional modules in parallel**” as “The system can be implemented to include a multi-stage processing pipeline, each pipeline stage including multiple processing modules and an execution management

Art Unit: 2100

framework, and capable of multi-threading operation to cause the plug-ins to execute in series or in parallel to speed processing by the plug-ins while accommodating computational dependencies. In some embodiments, the system can also have a metering apparatus for collecting the metered user information, and a presentation manager for providing processed session data to data consumers” (Column 3, lines 22-31) and “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 8, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:

A) wherein the configuration file is in an extensible markup language (XML) format (Column 10, lines 4-7)

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the configuration file is in an extensible markup language (XML) format**” as “The configuration manager 150 generates a configuration file for each stage of the pipeline 518, preferably specifying configuration data in XML format” (Column 10, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in

reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 9, **Amro** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein at least one of the functional modules is a plug-in component of the application (Column 12, lines 3-17)

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein at least one of the functional modules is a plug-in component of the application**” as “An alternative preferred embodiment of the present invention involves altering the manner in which the actual search engine actually operates to include the ability to receive directions and instructions directly from the user-defined plug-in program. Instead of merely acting as a filter as described herein, the user-defined plug-in program can function to direct the flow of the search engine while it is searching. Such an implementation requires exposure of API's into the search engine so that a plug-in programmer can control various aspects of the search. This allows the search engine to be controlled programmatically by the plug-in program. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that an API (Application Program Interface) is a set of routines utilized by an application program to direct the performance of procedures by the computer's operation system” (Column 12, lines 3-17).

Regarding claim 10, **Amro** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein at least one of the functional modules is an external application (Column 10, lines 7-35).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein at least one of the functional modules is an external application**” as “As described at block 146, a plug-in program is designated for limiting the scope of on-line data searches to particular searches or to certain conditions (e.g., time conditions) such that the plug-in program may be called for processing by the on-line search engine during on-line data searches by the on-line search engine. A calling sequence is utilized to manage the link between the plug-in program and the search engine application. When a plug-in program call occurs, the

calling sequence acts as an agreement between the calling routine (i.e., the search engine) and the called plug-in program on how arguments will be passed and in what order, how values will be returned, and which routine will handle any necessary housekeeping (e.g., cleaning up the stack). As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism.” (Column 10, lines 7-35).

Regarding claim 11, **Amro** teaches a method comprising:

- A) obtaining a set of one or more parameters required for invoking the specified functional module (Column 10, lines 20-35);
- B) wherein at least one of one or more parameters comprises a field of the query result (Column 10, lines 20-35, lines 52-60);
- C) invoking one or more of the specified functional modules whose required parameters are available in a result set collection (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);
- D) wherein the result set collection is configured to store the query result and an output of the functional module, as the functional module is invoked to process the query result (Column 11, lines 58-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);
- E) obtaining a result set in response to invoking the one or more functional modules (Column 11, lines 58-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);

Art Unit: 2100

F) adding the result set to the result set collection (Column 11, lines 58-67-Column 12, lines 1-2); and

H) returning the processed query result to the application (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**obtaining a set of one or more parameters required for invoking the specified functional modules**” as “As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism” (Column 10, lines 20-35). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein at least one of one or more parameters comprises a field of the query result**” as “As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would

be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism” (Column 10, lines 20-35) and “The type of plug-in program utilized herein depends upon the desires of a user. The user determines how many predefined traits are to be utilized during a search. For example, a user may be knowledgeable about a certain topic, and may want to avoid certain sites or areas altogether. Depending upon the type of plug-in program designated by the user, the search engine calls this plug-in program to perform the search, avoiding sites or areas in response to instructions processed by the plug-in program” (Column 10, lines 52-60). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **“invoking one or more of the specified functional modules whose required parameters are available in a result set collection”** as “A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search” (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), “If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that “plugs” into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine “hits.” Such algorithms are referred to in the art as “plug-in” programs or also as “plug-ins.” The plug-in program determines if a given “hit” is linked to the few parts of the “world” in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an “AND” condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting “hit” is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor” (Column 11, lines 10-25), and “As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface,

Art Unit: 2100

assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches "**wherein the result set collection is configured to store the query result and an output of each of the plurality of functional modules, as each of the plurality of functional modules is invoked to process the query result**" as "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches "**obtaining a result set in response to invoking the one or more functional modules**" as "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches "**adding the result set to the result set collection**" as "As illustrated at block 185, the user

Art Unit: 2100

performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by the at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As

illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"receiving the query result retrieved from the database"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User

Art Unit: 2100

Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"invoking the plurality of functional modules the process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the

search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"returning the processed query result to the application"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine

"hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

Amro does not explicitly teach:

- G) repeating steps (A)-(D) until all the specified functional modules have been executed; and
- H) plurality of functional modules.

Young, however, teaches **"repeating steps (A)-(D) until all the specified functional modules have been executed"** as "Each plug-in 662, 664, or 666 includes a dependency counter 670A-C (or, alternatively, is associated with a counter stored in memory). Prior to execution, the execution management framework 652 causes the counter for each plug-in to be loaded with a count that indicates the number of plug-ins on which it depends. As a plug-in 662, 664, or 666 completes execution, it notifies the execution management framework 652. A count conditioning mechanism, e.g., the illustrated decrementer 672 in the framework 652, causes the counter 670A-C of any plug-ins dependent on the then executed plug-in to be decremented by a single count. This continues iteratively upon each execution until a predetermined threshold is reached, e.g., a count of zero, for a particular plug-in. (Alternatively, an incrementer could be used, and incremented to a predetermined threshold.) When the threshold is reached for the counter 670A-C of a particular plug-in 662, 664, 666, that plug-in can be executed because its dependencies have been resolved" (Column 15, lines 3-20), and **"plurality of functional modules"** as "A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in

Art Unit: 2100

sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins" (Column 9, lines 12-24) and "The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed" (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young's** would have allowed **Amro's** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 12, **Amro** further teaches a method comprising:

A) wherein the result set collection comprises results received in response to issuing a query (Column 11, lines 58-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

The examiner notes that **Young** teaches "**wherein the result set collection comprises results received in response to issuing a query**" as "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit"

list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user” (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 13, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein the interface is utilized to specify a plurality of functional modules by specifying a multi-analysis functional module.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the interface is utilized to specify a plurality of functional modules by specifying a multi-analysis functional module**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork

plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 14, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a method comprising:
A) wherein obtaining the set of one or more parameters required for invoking the specified functional modules comprises retrieving information from a configuration file relating the multi-analysis functional module to the specified functional modules.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein obtaining the set of one or more parameters required for invoking the specified functional modules comprises retrieving information from a configuration file relating the multi-analysis functional module to the specified functional modules**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage

in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 15, **Amro** teaches a computer readable storage medium comprising:

- A) providing an interface for specifying a functional module (Column 10, lines 20-35);
- B) providing a configuration file containing information regarding invocation of the functional module (Column 10, lines 20-35, and lines 52-60);
- C) wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by the at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);
- D) receiving the query result retrieved from the database (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);
- E) invoking the functional module to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file (Column 10, lines 61-67-

Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2); and

F) returning the processed query result to the application (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**providing an interface for specifying a functional module**” as “As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism” (Column 10, lines 20-35). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches “**providing a configuration file containing information regarding invocation of the functional module**” as “As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a

Art Unit: 2100

customization/selection mechanism" (Column 10, lines 20-35) and "The type of plug-in program utilized herein depends upon the desires of a user. The user determines how many predefined traits are to be utilized during a search. For example, a user may be knowledgeable about a certain topic, and may want to avoid certain sites or areas altogether. Depending upon the type of plug-in program designated by the user, the search engine calls this plug-in program to perform the search, avoiding sites or areas in response to instructions processed by the plug-in program" (Column 10, lines 52-60). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by the at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e.,

setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"receiving the query result retrieved from the database"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search

engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"invoking the functional module to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is

then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"returning the processed query result to the application"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits"

with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

Amro does not explicitly teach:

G) plurality of functional modules.

Young, however, teaches "**plurality of functional modules**" as "A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins" (Column 9, lines 12-24) and "The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed" (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young's** would have allowed **Amro's** to provide a method for improving efficiency in

reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 16, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a computer readable storage medium comprising:

- A) wherein the interface is utilized to specify a single multi-analysis functional module used to invoke the plurality of functional modules; and
- B) the configuration file contains information relating the plurality of functional modules to the multi-analysis functional modules.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the interface is utilized to specify a single multi-analysis functional module used to invoke the plurality of functional modules**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process

the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6), and **“the configuration file contains information relating the plurality of functional modules to the multi-analysis functional modules”** as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young's** would have allowed **Amro's** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 17, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a computer readable storage medium comprising:

A) wherein the configuration file contains an explicit sequence in which the functional modules should be executed.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the configuration file contains an explicit sequence in which the functional modules should be executed**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young's** would have allowed **Amro's** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 18, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a computer readable storage medium comprising:

- A) wherein the configuration file contains information indicating one or more parameters required for invoking each of the functional modules; and
- B) invoking the plurality of functional modules comprises invoking only those functional modules whose one or more required parameters are available.

Young, however, teaches **“wherein the configuration file contains information indicating one or more parameters required for invoking each of the functional modules”** as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60), and **“invoking the plurality of functional modules comprises invoking only those functional modules whose one or more required parameters are available”** as “A stage configuration module 416 receives

configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 19, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a computer readable storage medium comprising:

A) wherein the configuration file is in an extensible markup language (XML) format (Column 10, lines 4-7)

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the configuration file is in an extensible markup language (XML) format**” as “The configuration manager 150 generates a configuration file for each stage of the pipeline 518, preferably specifying configuration data in XML format” (Column 10, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 20, **Amro** teaches a system comprising:

- A) a processor (Column 5, lines 27-36, Figure 2);
- B) a functional module, wherein the functional module is configured to process a query result retrieved from a database (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2);
- C) a configuration file containing information regarding execution of the functional module (Column 10, lines 20-35, and lines 52-60);
- D) wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2); and
- E) an application from which the functional module is accessible, herein the application which, when executed by a processor, is configured to provide an interface for specifying a functional module and execute the functional module to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file and present a user of the application with the processed query result (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5, Column 11, lines 10-25, Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**a processor**” as “Referring now to FIG. 2 there is depicted a block diagram of selected components in personal computer 10 of

FIG. 1 in which a preferred embodiment of the present invention may be implemented. Personal computer 10 of FIG. 1 preferably includes a system bus 20, as depicted in FIG. 2. System bus 20 is utilized for interconnecting and establishing communication between various components in personal computer 10. Microprocessor or central processing unit (CPU) 22 is connected to system bus 20 and also may have numeric co-processor 24 connected to it" (Column 5, lines 27-36). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"a functional module, wherein the functional module is configured to process a query result retrieved from a database"** as "As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism" (Column 10, lines 20-35) and "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"a configuration file containing information regarding execution of the functional module"** as "As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the

plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism" (Column 10, lines 20-35) and "The type of plug-in program utilized herein depends upon the desires of a user. The user determines how many predefined traits are to be utilized during a search. For example, a user may be knowledgeable about a certain topic, and may want to avoid certain sites or areas altogether. Depending upon the type of plug-in program designated by the user, the search engine calls this plug-in program to perform the search, avoiding sites or areas in response to instructions processed by the plug-in program" (Column 10, lines 52-60). The examiner further notes that **Amro** teaches **"wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search" (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), "If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that "plugs" into the

search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine "hits." Such algorithms are referred to in the art as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further notes that **Amro teaches "an application from which the functional module is accessible, herein the application which, when executed by a processor, is configured to provide an interface for specifying a functional module and execute the functional module to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file and present a user of the application with the processed query result"** as "A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions

Art Unit: 2100

based on data presented to it during the search” (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), “If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that “plugs” into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine “hits.” Such algorithms are referred to in the art as “plug-in” programs or also as “plug-ins.” The plug-in program determines if a given “hit” is linked to the few parts of the “world” in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an “AND” condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting “hit” is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor” (Column 11, lines 10-25), and “As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user “plug-in” program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine “hits” with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., “good” hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a “hit” list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user” (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2).

Amro does not explicitly teach:

F) plurality of functional modules.

Young, however, teaches “**plurality of functional modules**” as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8

need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 21, **Amro** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein the application is a query building application (Column 10, lines 7-35).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein the application is a query building application**” as “As described at block 146, a plug-in program is designated for limiting the scope of on-line data searches to particular searches or to certain conditions (e.g., time conditions) such that the plug-in program may be called for processing by the on-line search engine during on-line data searches by the on-line search engine. A calling sequence is utilized to manage the link between the plug-in program and the search engine application. When a plug-in program call occurs, the calling sequence acts as an agreement between the calling routine (i.e., the search engine) and the called plug-in program on how arguments will be passed and in what

Art Unit: 2100

order, how values will be returned, and which routine will handle any necessary housekeeping (e.g., cleaning up the stack). As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism.” (Column 10, lines 7-35).

Regarding claim 22, **Amro** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein at least one of the plurality of functional modules is a plug-in component of the application (Column 12, lines 3-17)

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein at least one of the plurality of functional modules is a plug-in component of the application**” as “An alternative preferred embodiment of the present invention involves altering the manner in which the actual search engine actually operates to include the ability to receive directions and instructions directly from the user-defined plug-in program. Instead of merely acting as a filter as described herein, the user-defined plug-in program can function to direct the flow of the search engine while it is searching. Such an implementation requires exposure of API's into the search engine so that a plug-in programmer can control various aspects of the search. This allows the search engine to be controlled programmatically by the plug-in program. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that an API (Application Program Interface) is a set of routines utilized by an application program to direct the performance of procedures by the computer's operation system” (Column 12, lines 3-17).

Regarding claim 23, **Amro** further teaches a system comprising:

A) wherein at least one of the plurality of functional modules is an external application (Column 10, lines 7-35).

The examiner notes that **Amro** teaches “**wherein at least one of the plurality of functional modules is an external application**” as “As described at block 146, a plug-in program is designated for limiting the scope of on-line data searches to particular searches or to certain conditions (e.g., time conditions) such that the plug-in program may be called for processing by the on-line search engine during on-line data searches by the on-line search engine. A calling sequence is utilized to manage the link between the plug-in program and the search engine application. When a plug-in program call occurs, the calling sequence acts as an agreement between the calling routine (i.e., the search engine) and the called plug-in program on how arguments will be passed and in what order, how values will be returned, and which routine will handle any necessary housekeeping (e.g., cleaning up the stack). As depicted at block 147, predefined parameters to be processed by the plug-in program are designated. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that the operation described at block 147 may be utilized in accordance with a Graphical User Interface for allowing the user to specify search criteria and customization parameters. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that such a Graphical User Interface can also present a selection/customization mechanism for the plug-in program. While it is possible to completely embody the customization of the search within the plug-in program, those skilled in the art will appreciate that such an implementation would not be very usable, since altering the search criteria would necessitate recompiling the plug-in program. Thus, a Graphical User Interface utilized in association with the plug-in program would be appropriate to handle a customization/selection mechanism.” (Column 10, lines 7-35).

Regarding claim 24, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein the interface is utilized to specify a single multi-analysis functional module used to invoke the plurality of functional modules; and

B) the configuration file contains information relating the plurality of functional modules to the multi-analysis functional modules.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the interface is utilized to specify a single multi-analysis functional module used to invoke the plurality of functional modules**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6), and “**the configuration file contains information relating the plurality of functional modules to the multi-analysis functional modules**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding

computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48) and “The pipeline operator can combine plug-ins into large chunks of functionality, called stages. Each stage is made up of several pipeline plug-ins. The pipeline infrastructure calls each plug-in in a stage in the correct order, managing the dependency and load balancing between the plug-ins. Communication between stages is based on a queuing architecture. Each stage manages a queue of messages, e.g., session objects. The pipeline infrastructure pulls the session objects off the queues when appropriate, and then calls the plug-ins in the right dependency order to process the session objects. After all the plug-ins have been processed in the stage, the infrastructure sends the session objects to the queues of additional stages. Any fork plug-ins redirect sessions to stages different from the ordinary sequence of stages in which the plug-ins would be processed” (Column 13, lines 59-67-Column 14, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 25, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

A) wherein the configuration file contains an explicit sequence in which the functional modules should be executed.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the configuration file contains an explicit sequence in which the functional modules should be executed**” as “the configuration manager can further include a dependency data table for maintaining data regarding computational dependencies; and an order determining mechanism, responsive to the dependency data, for tracking computational dependencies for the plug-ins and insuring the proper order of plug-in operation. The order determining mechanism can include a dependency counter associated with each plug-in for determining an operational sequence position of the associated plug-in, and means for conditioning the counter (e.g., decrementing or incrementing the count) in response to operation of another of the plug-ins on which the associated plug-in depends, so that the associated plug-in will commence operation in the proper order when the counter reaches a predetermined count or value. Thus, in conclusion, a mechanism is provided for tracking and enforcing the ordering of data processing by the processing modules so as to take into account dependencies between them” (Column 3, lines 32-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 26, **Amro** does not explicitly teach a system comprising:

- A) wherein the configuration file contains information indicating one or more parameters required for invoking each of the functional modules; and
- B) invoking the plurality of functional modules comprises invoking only those functional modules whose one or more required parameters are available.

Young, however, teaches “**wherein the configuration file contains information indicating one or more parameters required for invoking each of the functional modules**” as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files

418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60), and **“invoking the plurality of functional modules comprises invoking only those functional modules whose one or more required parameters are available”** as “A stage configuration module 416 receives configuration files 418 from the configuration manager 150, which define stage operations as well as operation of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 of the corresponding process space 404 and their processing interdependencies. The stage configuration module passes the plug-in configuration information to an execution management framework 425. The execution management framework 425 uses this information to determine which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 can be processed in parallel (and during the same clock cycles per clock 420) and which of the plug-ins nos. 1-8 need to be processed in sequence after other plug-ins because they depend on a final or intermediary result from the other plug-ins” (Column 9, lines 12-24) and “The configuration file holds

information associated with each node in the graph 600 as needed to execute the plug-in, including information specifying the number of other plug-ins on which each plug-in depends. The stage uses that information in executing the plug-ins in the correct order. At any given time, it might be possible to execute more than one plug-in: if two plug-ins do not depend on each other, the two plug-ins can be executed in any order, or can be executed simultaneously (i.e., in parallel during the same clock cycle) by multiple threads. Therefore, for instance, if a plug-in will take a long time to execute because it must wait on the results of a database query by another plug-in, the pipeline infrastructure can execute other plug-ins in the mean time. At any time, any plug-in that has zero dependencies can be executed” (Column 14, lines 46-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because teaching **Young’s** would have allowed **Amro’s** to provide a method for improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing, as noted by **Young** (Column 2, lines 32-35).

(10) Response to Argument

A. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Amro et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,041,326) and in view of **Young** (U.S. Patent 6,560,606).

Arguments (1): Regarding Independent Claims 1, 11, 15, and 20 Appellant argues that “the passages cited by the Examiner reflect that a plug-in may be used to filter a list of websites returned by an internet search engine” and “Nothing in these passages describe a configuration file that contains information specifying how the output of one functional module may be required as an input to another, and on this basis “invoking the plurality of functional modules to process the query result in a manner determined according to information retrieved from the configuration file,” as recited by the present claims. Instead, a filter is used to refine web-site results.

Applicants submit, therefore, that the disclosure in Amro of a plug-in configured to refine a list of website links (through filtering and/or rank ordering) fails to disclose “a configuration file containing information regarding invocation of the functional modules,” in particular, where “the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules ”.

However, the independent claims merely state “wherein the configuration file specifies at least an input field of the query result required by the at least one of the functional modules and at least one output field produced by one of the plurality of functional modules”. The examiner wishes to point to Columns 10-12 of **Amro** which state “A user-defined plug-in program thus functions between the actual search engine utilized by the user and the user. Search results from the search engine can be filtered through such user-defined plug-in programs. The filtered search results are then displayed for the user as the actual search results. Traditional search engines require the user to statically specify the search criteria in advance of performing the actual search. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, however, dynamic search criteria are provided. The search provides an intelligent program that performs dynamic search decisions based on data presented to it during the search” (Column 10, lines 61-67-Column 11, lines 1-5), “If the plant life has a common name that results in a large number of hits resulting from a particular search via a search engine, a program that “plugs” into the search engine applies a series of tests and determinations to the resulting data stream of search engine “hits.” Such algorithms are referred to in the art

as "plug-in" programs or also as "plug-ins." The plug-in program determines if a given "hit" is linked to the few parts of the "world" in which the university professor knows that these particular types of plant life exist. Aside from the addition of an "AND" condition associated with the remote network location resulting from the data search by the search engine, the URL (Universal Resource Locator) associated with the resulting "hit" is checked by the plug-in program to exclude certain groups that are determined not to be useful to the professor" (Column 11, lines 10-25), and "As illustrated at block 185, the user performs search customizations (i.e., setting parameters) via a Graphical User Interface, assuming such a Graphical User Interface is utilized in association with the search engine. As depicted at block 186, a search is then performed and as depicted at block 187, the user "plug-in" program acts as a filter by comparing the search engine "hits" with the database of known (i.e., previous) hits. Undesirable hits are thus weeded out in this manner, and the desirable hits (i.e., "good" hits) are presented, as illustrated at block 188. Finally, as illustrated at block 190, a "hit" list and ranking of such hits is presented to the user" (Column 11, lines 59-67-Column 12, lines 1-2). The examiner further wishes to state that it is clear that **Amro's** method teaches the input field of the query result as the initial unfiltered result set, and the output field as the filtered result set specified by the user parameters before the plug-in is invoked. Furthermore, as depicted in **Amro's** example of the plant life query result, the initial unfiltered query list is inputted into the plug-in, wherein after the execution (invocation) of that plug-in, results specifically specified according to personalized predetermined user inputted parameters (configuration file) are sent to a user (the output of the plug-in). Therefore,

Amro's plug-in which refines a query result set according to customized settings teaches aforementioned limitation.

Moreover, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "a configuration file that contains information specifying how the output of one functional module may be required as an input to another") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Instead, it is merely claimed that a configuration file specifies an input query field that is required by one of the functional modules and an output field that is required by one of the functional modules. No output of one functional module that is required as the input of another is ever claimed.

Arguments (2): Regarding Independent Claims 1, 11, 15, and 20 Appellant argues that "It is entirely unclear how the Examiner believes that the "pipeline stages" used to process an "input queue" to determine how much to charge a consumer for using a particular telecommunication service could be combined with a particular plug-in program configured to process a list of website links returned by a search engine".

However, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case the motivation of “improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing” allows **Amro’s** method to incorporate the multiple plug-ins of **Young**. Moreover, because both **Amro** and **Young** deal with plug-ins, the plurality of plug-ins of **Young** can be combined with **Amro’s** plug-in query refining results system.

In addition, appellants argue that “Applicants submit, however, that this general goal of “improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing,” fails to provide any specific indication of just how the proposed combination would operate, if operate at all” and “it is unclear as to what, exactly, is being improved in efficiency as suggested by the Examiner...Other than the use of the word “plug-in” the techniques appear to be completely unrelated to one another”.

However, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, once again, the motivation of “improving efficiency in reducing overhead associated with processing” allows **Amro’s** method to incorporate the multiple plug-ins of **Young**. Moreover, because both **Amro** and **Young** deal with plug-ins, they are related.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Mahesh Dwivedi

Patent Examiner

AU 2168

/Mahesh H Dwivedi/

Examiner, Art Unit 2168

/Tim T. Vo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168

Tim Vo

Supervisory Patent Examiner

AU 2168

/Eddie C Lee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, TC 2100

Eddie Lee

Appeals Practice Specialist

